UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

In re: BRIDGESTONE/FIRESTONE, INC.,) Master File No. IP 00-93/3-C-B/S
TIRES PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION) MDL NO. 1373
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO)
IP 00-5011 (Urdaneta); IP 00-5013 (Salas);)
IP 00-5082 (Oca); IP 00-5084 (Oca);)
IP 00-5085 (Castellano); IP 00-5086 (Oca);)
IP 00-5102 (Paniz); IP 00-5103 (Casadiego);)
IP 00-5105 (Oca); IP 00-5107 (Paniz);)
IP 00-5111 (Paniz); IP 00-5112 (Octavio);)
IP 00-5113 (Dias); IP 01-5189 (Perozo);)
IP 01-5190 (Perozo); IP 01-5191 (Perozo);)
IP 01-5219 (LaCruz); IP 01-5220 (LaCruz);)
IP 01-5221 (Figueredo); IP 01-5261 (Campos);)
IP 01-5263 (Junio); IP 01-5264 (Teran);)
IP 01-5265 (Roitman); IP 01-5262 (Esparza);)
IP 01-5268 (Pedraza): IP 01-5321 (Pedraza))

ENTRY REGARDING DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR LEAVE TO FILE REPLY

These cases are before the magistrate judge on the defendants' motions entitled Motion for Leave to File a Reply to Plaintiff's [Sic.] Response to Motion to Compel. The motions are **DENIED**. The magistrate judge believes that her Entry on Plaintiffs' Emergency Motion to Strike Motions to Compel Filed by Defendants, dated June 20, 2002, made it abundantly clear that reply briefs would be permitted only if the magistrate judge deemed them necessary and appropriate, and that the magistrate judge would inform the defendants whether she would entertain a reply brief in support of a given motion after reviewing the plaintiffs' response to that motion. This ruling was made in lieu of granting the plaintiffs' motion to strike the defendants' motions to compel, which was the magistrate judge's other alternative, in light of the fact that the arguments made in plaintiffs' motion to strike were well taken, and

the plaintiffs' belief that the defendants' motions to compel bordered on harassment was not at all unreasonable. For each of the defendants' motions to compel that was subject to the June 20, 2002, Entry, as well as the additional motion to compel addressed by the defendants in the instant motions for leave, the magistrate judge will issue an order which will set forth whether and to what extent the defendants may file a reply brief.

ENTERED this _____ day of July 2002.

V. Sue Shields United States Magistrate Judge Southern District of Indiana

Copies to:

Victor Manuel Diaz Jr Podhurst Orseck Josefsberg & Eaton City National Bank Bldg Ste 800 25 W Flagler Street Miami, FL 33130

Randall Riggs Locke Reynolds LLP 201 N Illinois St Suite 1000 PO Box 44961 Indianapolis, IN 46244-0961

William E Winingham Wilson Kehoe & Winingham 2859 North Meridian Street P.O. Box 1317 Indianapolis, IN 46206-1317

^{&#}x27;The magistrate judge notes that IP 01-5261 (Campos), IP 01-5262 (Esparza), IP 01-5263 (Junio), IP 01-5264 (Teran), and IP 01-5265 (Roitman) were not addressed by the plaintiffs' motion to strike, and accordingly were not included in the June 20, 2002, Entry, but inasmuch as the defendants have treated them as if they were, the magistrate judge will as well.